DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 357 683 HE 026 430

TITLE	Symposium on Information Resources, Services and Programs Proceedings (Austin, Texas, May 24, 1990).
INSTITUTION	Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Aug 90
NOTE	28p.; For related documents, see HE 026 428-443.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education; Colleges; *Economically Disadvantaged; Federal Programs; *Government Role; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; *Information Dissemination; Information Needs; Information Services; *Intervention; *Minority Groups; Program Administration; Public Policy; School Holding Power

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the symposium reported in this paper was to forge a consensus on how federal information and intervention strategies can be improved to raise the postsecondary enrollment and persistence rates of disadvantaged and minority youth. Speakers outlined the systemic forces that forestall access and their consequences for at-risk youth. They also described powerful interventions that can help overcome some of these barriers. Following brief opening remarks, Brian K. Fitzgerald gave an overview of the analytical issues at stake. There followed four sessions each featuring a moderator and two-to-four presenters. Session titles were as follows: (1) "The Need for Information Programs and Interventions"; (2) "The Role of Information Programs and Interventions in Improving and Maintaining Access"; (3) "Model Information Programs and Interventions: Institutional, State and Federal"; and (4) "The Federal Role and Strategy in Information Programs and Intervention." The document summarizes the remarks of each presenter and sketches the issues and opinions offered in all the post-presentation discussions that occurred. An appendix contains lists of presenters and Advisory Committee Members. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED357683

PROCEEDINGS

Symposium on Information Resources, Services and Programs

. . .

May 24, 1990

LBJ School of Public Affairs
University of Texas
Austin, TX

. . .

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

HE 1126 430

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PROCEEDINGS

Symposium on Information Resources, Services and Programs

. . .

May 24, 1990

LBJ School of Public Affairs
University of Texas
Austin, TX

. . .

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

FOREWORD

The United States Congress, as part of Public Law 99-498, established the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance as an independent source of "advice and counsel to the Congress and the Secretary of Education" on issues related to student financial aid. Congress charged the Committee to "make recommendations that will result in the maintenance of access for low- and middle-income students." In early 1989, Congress asked the Committee to explore issues for consideration during the next reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in 1991. The Advisory Committee identified three issue areas as a framework for its reauthorization activities: need analysis and the delivery system; information resources, services and programs; and studies, surveys and analyses.

This document focuses on the second of these reauthorization areas. It chronicles the Advisory Committee's Symposium on Information Resources, Services, and Programs, held at the University of Texas in Austin on May 24, 1990. (A symposium was held in the first reauthorization area, need analysis and delivery, on December 4, 1989, in Washington, D.C.) The Committee began its work in this area much earlier--its hearing in August 1989 focused in part on outreach and information programs. After that hearing, the Committee commissioned a series of background papers that were published in May 1990. One of these reviewed existing research on the factors that affect minority participation in postsecondary education. Another considered the amount and quality of information low-income disadvantaged students have about returns to education, college costs, and academic preparation. A third examined the most promising federal, state, and institutional early interventions.

The purpose of the symposium in May 1990 was to forge a consensus on how federal information and intervention strategies can be improved to raise the postsecondary enrollment and persistence rates of disadvantaged and minority youth. The Committee is persuaded that comprehensive, early and regular intervention throughout the education process holds great promise for improving both enrollment and persistence rates--and that accurate, timely information is a key component of such intervention.

Ensuring equal access to postsecondary education has been the primary goal of the federal student aid programs for twenty-five years. Despite significant success, these programs have not been able to raise postsecondary participation by disadvantaged and minority youth to acceptable levels. That is, in their current configuration and at their current levels, they have not been able to overcome more powerful factors that are at work. In large measure, this has occurred because of an overly narrow definition of access. The Committee believes that access must be viewed as a sequential process that begins in high school or earlier and extends through persistence in college.

At the May symposium, speakers outlined the systemic forces that forestall access, and their consequences for at-risk youth. They also described powerful interventions that can help overcome some of these barriers. In short, the presentations delivered that day reinforced the Committee's belief that marginal changes in existing programs are not the answer. We now know enough about the nature and severity of the problem, as well as the vast promise early interventions hold in solving it, to challenge Congress and the Department of Education to design a bold new approach to disadvantaged and minority participation in postsecondary education.

The Committee is seeking a comprehensive strategy that has a reasonable chance to produce significant progress in the near term. We cannot afford the considerable social and economic costs of continued underparticipation by substantial numbers of our citizens. And we will not be able to pretend in the year 2000 that we did not know in 1990 what was required to meet the goal of equal access to postsecondary education.

Mr. James R. Craig
Chairman of the Advisory Committee August 3, 1990

CONTENTS

FOREWORD i

WELCOME 1

OPENING REMARKS 3

OVERVIEW OF ANALYTICAL ISSUES 5

SESSION I: The Need for Information Programs and Interventions 7

SESSION II: The Role of Information Programs and Interventions in Improving and Maintaining Access 11

SESSION III: Model Information Programs and Interventions: Institutional, State and Federal 15

SESSION IV: The Federal Role and Strategy in Information Programs and Intervention 19

CLOSING REMARKS 21

APPENDIX A: List of Presenters 23

APPENDIX B: Advisory Committee Members 25

Symposium on Information Resources, Services and Programs

WELCOME

Speaker: **Mr. Joseph L. McCormick**
Advisory Committee Vice-Chairman
Executive Director, Texas Guaranteed Student Loan Corporation

Mr. Joseph L. McCormick noted the significance of the symposium's setting at the LBJ School of Public Affairs twenty-five years after President Johnson's signing of the Higher Education Act. He stated that neither Congress nor the Advisory Committee believes that information alone is sufficient to guarantee access, but noted a growing realization that broad new interventions, with information as an integral component, are needed. New strategies are needed because the assumptions that backed the student aid programs through the 1970s and into the 1980s have proven faulty.

Current policies assume that reducing the net price of postsecondary education to disadvantaged and minority students would close gaps in educational attainment. But this strategy has failed, Mr. McCormick said. Today policymakers are seeking a "more forceful dual strategy"--one that will help students make it through the educational pipeline as well as provide resources to those who are able to make it through the pipeline on their own. Today the Advisory Committee is urging a "bold new approach" because the problems of equal access are worsening and because time is running out.

OPENING REMARKS

Speaker: **Dr. Patricia Hayes**
President, St. Edward's University

As president of St. Edward's. which recognizes the importance of effective outreach and mentoring in ensuring access for disadvantaged students, **Dr. Patricia Hayes** is in a good position to address the issues raised by the symposium. She described the student body at St. Edward's, noting that 40 percent of the freshmen come from families with incomes of less than $25,000. St. Edward's has a long history of working with migrant families. Recently, however, the University has had to reduce the number of participants in the federal College Assistance Migrant Program (currently about 140 students) because the University's cost to help underwrite the program has risen dramatically. A major flaw of CAMP is that it fails to cover costs beyond the freshman year. Furthermore, CAMP can serve only a fraction of the eligible population; at present, five programs nationally serve 500 students, out of a pool of 8,000 migrant high school graduates. Dr. Hayes said.

Dr. Hayes emphasized the importance of providing ongoing support and advocacy as well as information to these students, whose families view college as hostile to family values and who have a host of fears about the college experience to overcome. Concern for at-risk students must extend beyond simply getting them in the door, she said.

OVERVIEW OF ANALYTICAL ISSUES

Speaker: **Dr. Brian K. Fitzgerald**
Advisory Committee Staff Director

Dr. Brian K. Fitzgerald stated the overall purpose of the symposium as one of forging an analytical consensus on issues related to minority underparticipation in postsecondary education. He described the specific analytical issues the symposium is designed to address as:

- The magnitude and severity of the problem of access to higher education for minority and disadvantaged youth;
- The relative importance of various factors associated with underparticipation;
- The effectiveness of the current funding levels and structures of federal programs in solving the access problem;
- The value of existing intervention and information strategies, and
- The manner in which changes in federal policy can be made.

Underscoring the severity of the problem, Dr. Fitzgerald noted, are the powerful forces exerted by demographic changes--the transformation of the minority into majority in several regions--and the structural changes in the economy that are widening the gap between the educated and the uneducated. The lead time involved in improving the pipeline also attests to the urgency of the issue: today's 8th graders will not join the ranks of Ph.D.s until at least the year 2003.

Dr. Fitzgerald said that as late as the mid-1980s widespread disagreement persisted about the scope of an access problem for minority youth, and the debate contained several dimensions. There was argument over whether participation rates were actually falling. Furthermore, when acknowledged, decreased participation was characterized as a function of a decline in the perceived value of higher education. Such an assumption rested on the faulty model of informed consumers making rational choices among higher education, the military and the workforce.

This symposium was designed to forge consensus on the relative importance of various factors in underparticipation, since effective remedies rest on an understanding of these factors, Dr. Fitzgerald said. Thus, the Advisory Committee must assess the significance of poverty, unemployment and poor academic preparation as they relate to other factors, such as family expectations, composition of financial aid awards, and financial aid information.

In its scrutiny of federal policy, Dr. Fitzgerald said, the Advisory Committee is attempting to determine the likelihood that the current level and mix of federal programs are adequate to solve the problem. Today the federal government is spending nearly $20 billion in postsecondary education alone on need-based aid and intervention; states and institutions are committing another $6.8 billion. The Advisory Committee must evaluate the extent of improvement that can be gained by marginal additions to existing programs.

In forging a consensus on federal responsibilities, the Advisory Committee will pay particularly close attention to the integration and coordination of federal policy with state and institutional efforts.

SESSION I

The Need for Information Programs and Interventions

Moderator: **Dr. James C. Flippin**
Director, Mississippi Guaranteed Student Loan Agency

Presenters: **Dr. Elias Blake, Jr.**
Howard University

Dr. Michael Olivas
University of Houston

Dr. Gary Orfield
University of Chicago

Moderator **Dr. James C. Flippin** noted that for years, both the educational and research community resisted the realization that enrollment and persistence rates of disadvantaged and minority students were declining. Today, however, faced with undeniable realities, educators and researchers have a renewed interest in examining the underlying factors associated with underparticipation in postsecondary education by minorities.

PRESENTATIONS

Dr. Elias Blake described the dramatic expansion of black enrollment in higher education between 1960-1976, a period in which the number of blacks attending college roughly quadrupled. Since 1976, however, a "systematic stall" has occurred: enrollments are stagnant; completion rates for academic programs have decreased, and completion rates for professional programs have fluctuated. Contrary to popular belief, Dr. Blake said, the downward trend in black participation began prior to the financial aid cutbacks of the early 1980s; thus he believes the interaction of other, more systemic factors with the financial aid system is responsible.

To illustrate the problems of achieving educational parity, Dr. Blake compared the ratio of baccalaureates going to blacks to the number of blacks in the K-12 system in 15 states. These states represent 60 percent of black higher education enrollments, and the comparison over 10 years shows a decline. Most of the states are Adams states that are subject to the landmark desegregation order. A look at the ratio of

first-time enrollment among blacks to the black school population revealed a "much better pattern," according to the researcher. Dr. Blake argued that while attaining parity appears daunting, in fact the absolute numbers of students and institutions affected are not overwhelming. Nevertheless, he added, the numbers pose an "accumulated deficit" that will reach into the 21st century.

Dr. Blake viewed with alarm what he described as "significantly changing signals" from the higher education community toward the disadvantaged and minority populations. Whereas institutions formerly embraced these students with the fervor of a crusader or advocate, the rise of concerns about quality and academic standards beginning in the 1980s created a mixed message. Since the decision to attend college precedes the financial aid process, the information emanating from colleges and universities is particularly important. He cited the Army's successful recruiting advertisements for their effectiveness in communicating the relationship between training and its payoff, and suggested that higher education undertake a "content campaign" to obtain similar results.

Dr. Blake concluded that the capacity of the current educational system to address underrepresentation of poor and minority students has peaked; new resources and strategies are needed to overcome the current stagnation.

Dr. Michael Olivas introduced his remarks with a description of a discussion with Upward Bound students. That episode impressed upon him the differences in the college-going experiences of minority or low-income students and affluent students. He described the limitations of the current student aid system, in particular three dimensions that act as a barrier to higher education participation by blacks and hispanics: inequities in the distribution of information, the negative consequences of an overly complex financial aid system, and institutional aid practices.

Dr. Olivas called the impact of information inequities particularly severe in minority communities, especially bilingual communities. These communities operate with less formal information structures and English is less likely to be the primary language. In such communities, the social networks of college-going students or alumni recruiters are unavailable to students and parents. College recruiting is largely directed to National Merit Scholars or to athletes; few institutions pursue the "medium or low scorers."

On the second issue, the complexity of the student aid system, Olivas said its intricacies render financial aid programs "virtually inaccessible to poor families." Not only are completing forms and calculating assets almost impossible without assistance, but most families lack access to information from lenders about financing options. The "start-up" costs associated with college-going--application fees, test and transcript fees, form preparation expenses, and so forth--pose "the most detrimental consequence" of

the system's complexity. But rather than reduce or eliminate flawed student assistance programs, Dr. Olivas said, institutions must work with policymakers to ensure that financial aid is targeted to those in greatest need with "maximum accessibility and minimum red tape."

According to Dr. Olivas, institutional aid policies themselves constitute the most formidable barrier to Hispanic college participation. While Hispanic students are receiving more need-based aid, little institutional aid is being directed to these families. His own study showed that more than 60 percent of Hispanic freshmen received only one source of aid: a Pell Grant, which covered only half the cost of attendance.

Dr. Gary Orfield presented an array of demographic, enrollment and other indicators related to access. In summary, these figures showed the growth of minority youth among the school-age population; the increasing segregation of blacks and Hispanic youth; the disparity in high school completion rates between inner-city and suburban students; the disparity in sources and amounts of information about college between white and minority students; the increasing underrepresentation of Hispanics in college enrollments, and a decrease in community college transfer rates, particularly among Hispanics.

Dr. Orfield contested several widely-held assumptions about the college-going process--that students know the academic requirements for college and college costs; that the student aid system is accessible, that federal, state and institutional aid is well coordinated; that the poor receive aid; and that granting access to a two-year institution is sufficient. In fact, he said, aid goes to students with the knowledge and/or connections to get it. Students clustered in center-city schools are the most isolated from college and financial aid information, and the complexity of the aid system works against disadvantaged students in single-parent families. The effects can be seen, according to Dr. Orfield, in lower educational aspirations, a widening income gap in college participation, and the low college completion rates of those who do enter (fewer than one-fifth of high school graduates from center-city schools who started in 1980 had received degrees by 1986).

The researcher suggested that families eligible for other forms of assistance be notified about their eligibility for student aid and that colleges play a larger role in assisting in the process. Such notification should occur early and be accompanied by counseling and other support services, and Dr. Orfield recommended a "substantial expansion" of TRIO programs, particularly Upward Bound. Outreach should include accurate information about two-year and four-year programs. Further, with regard to student aid policies, incentives should be devised to make aid truly need-based, to counter situations like that of Illinois, in which the bulk of aid goes to private, predominantly white institutions.

DISCUSSION

Much of the discussion focused on two central questions--whether the current system, with minor adjustments, could ameliorate the problems of access and whether the primary responsibility for such improvements rests with the federal government. The panelists unanimously endorsed major, systemic changes to improve the participation of minority and disadvantaged students in higher education. They also asserted the primacy of the federal role. **Dr. Olivas** said current structures are inadequate because the program design favors those who can "negotiate the system." **Dr. Blake** agreed, saying systemic forces are "too powerful to be affected by minor changes in the student aid system." He reiterated the importance of higher education revising its message to make the promise of access explicit and to assure at-risk students that they will be aided and supported in a college environment. To Committee member **Mr. Biklen**'s inquiry of whether more aid, or other strategies, would make a greater difference in improving access, the panelists agreed that simply providing more aid would produce only marginal results. Dr. Olivas argued for the redistribution of aid in favor of information, saying that the TRIO programs, particularly the successful Talent Search program, are greatly underfunded.

The panelists' answer to Committee member **Dr. Koplik**, who asked whether the business community, rather than the federal government, should become the catalyst for desired change, was an emphatic "No." Dr. Olivas elaborated that while community-led efforts can be useful, as exemplified by those in Cleveland and Boston, such programs work only on the margins; the private sector could not be expected to shoulder the primary responsibility in this area.

SESSION II

The Role of Information Programs and Interventions in Improving and Maintaining Access

Moderator: **Dr. Stanley Z. Koplik**
Executive Director, Kansas Board of Regents

Presenters: **Dr. A. Dallas Martin, Jr.**
National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators

Ms. Maureen Hoyler
National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations

Mr. John J. McCarthy
U.S. Department of Education

Dr. Stanley Z. Koplik commented that the previous presentations demonstrated the severity of the access problem and that instead of reacting with resignation, policymakers must use "every means at our disposal" to solve the problem now. He introduced the presenters in the session who were to discuss the manner in which interventions that make use of information could be strengthened.

PRESENTATIONS

Dr. A. Dallas Martin, Jr. described recent activities NASFAA has undertaken, including a compendium of 85 early awareness and outreach programs. Key elements of successful programs were spelled out in *Certainty of Opportunity*, a report of a 1988 conference sponsored by NASFAA and the American Council on Education.
Dr. Martin distinguished general information programs from early awareness and intervention programs directed to at-risk, nontraditional students. He cited financial support, leadership, local enthusiasm, parental and guardian participation, and thorough dissemination as important factors in program effectiveness. Research has demonstrated that parental involvement is an especially critical component of any intervention, he said.

Dr. Martin lamented the lack of leadership and activism surrounding this set of issues today, comparing it with the events of the 1960s that translated into increased educational opportunity. He criticized the framework for and contents of college information designed for minority and disadvantaged students, saying much of it fails to meet their needs.

Rather than wait for reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, Dr. Martin urged the following steps be taken at once with existing structures and funds:

- The Education Department should support demonstration projects, such as the one sponsored by the National Association of College Admissions Counselors;
- ED should promote the sharing of research and information through such vehicles as the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE);
- ED should also make use of the Fund for the Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching (FIRST); and
- Colleges and universities need to become proactive in this area, particularly with regard to articulation between two- and four-year institutions.

Ms. Maureen Hoyler described the population served by TRIO programs and discussed problems she sees with the information that population receives. Of the 500,000 students served by TRIO, 350,000 are students who are preparing for college. Despite the fact that these low-income students are the target of Title IV, Ms. Hoyler said TRIO remains "at the periphery of the discussion" on campuses and at the national level.

Ms. Hoyler cited several dimensions of an information gap. Poor and minority youth do not simply receive inadequate information about college, but discouraging information. The message low-income and minority students receive is that even if they do enroll, they do not have a realistic chance of graduating from college, and that students who go to college--whether or not they graduate--are burdened with very heavy debt. Unless the message is changed, simply providing more information won't persuade such students that college is worthwhile for them. Furthermore, the information gap goes both ways; institutions' quest for the ideal minority student reveals their lack of information about minority communities and about "at-risk" youth. Finally, Ms. Hoyler said, advocacy must go hand in hand with information; she cited the importance of strengthening student support services for those who enroll.

Mr. John J. McCarthy described the target audiences and the services and publications provided by the Department of Education's Division of Training and Dissemination within the Office of Postsecondary Education. The target audience is dictated by the inquiries the Division receives. The Department of Education responds to 10,000 letters per month. In addition, it maintains a toll-free phone number and answers about 75,000 calls per month from students, parents, aid administrators and others seeking financial aid information. In addition to providing the toll-free number. the Department provides publications, posters and tape cassettes for the visually impaired. Mr. McCarthy called on two colleagues, Mr. High and Mr. Ryan, to complete the presentation.

Mr. Mike High discussed the Department of Education's financial aid publications. The *Student Guide*, which is a major source of information for counselors and students, has been abbreviated in 1990-91 due to budget constraints but will be more complete in the 1991-92 academic year. In addition to manuals, the Department is preparing a new brochure for high school students that emphasizes the importance of staying in school and choosing a postsecondary institution that meets one's needs. In planning new outreach, the Department hopes to dramatize the rewards of postsecondary education, emphasize the availability of financial aid and stress the necessity of academic preparation.

Mr. Bill Ryan mentioned new projects the Department is considering to reach students outside its traditional audience, the college-bound and their families. One idea is to develop an interactive telephone system that would provide callers with individualized pre-eligibility aid estimates based on callers' responses to key questions in need analysis. A less costly alternative would be a pamphlet containing a chart of rough pre-eligibility aid estimates aimed at high school students and their families. The Department is soliciting ideas.

DISCUSSION

Several participants raised questions about the design and content of financial aid information disseminated by the Department of Education. The most persistent concern was the appropriateness of the material for a low-income audience. **Dr. A. Dallas Martin Jr.** said existing pamphlets as well as the proposed phone system are aimed at middle-income families and doubted whether they reach the illiterate or bilingual. To target low-income families, **Ms. Ellen Frishberg** of Johns Hopkins University suggested the Department of Education coordinate its information efforts with those of other federal agencies, such as the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Labor.

Participants also criticized the lack of coordination between federal, state and institutional information efforts. **Dr. T. Edward Hollander** (also a symposium presenter) described the limited usefulness of the federal materials for students in New Jersey and suggested that the Department of Education support state information efforts in order to provide complete rather than partial information. Another participant raised concern about the limits of pre-eligibility information, particularly with regard to institutional aid.

Other comments focused variously on the insufficient outreach of colleges and universities to minority, particularly Hispanic, communities, the inadequate resources of community colleges to deal with at-risk students, and the role of proprietary schools in educating these populations.

SESSION III

Model Information Programs and Interventions: Institutional, State and Federal

Moderator: **Dr. David Malek**
Associate Dean for Natural Sciences
College of DuPage

Presenters: **Dr. Edward A. Johnson**
Arizona Board of Regents

Mr. Peter Keitel
New York State Higher Education Services Corporation

Mr. Wilfred Easter
Mathematics Engineering Science Achievement (MESA) Program,
University of California at Berkeley

Mr. Cesar Mario Trimble
Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities

Moderator **Dr. David Malek** noted that the previous session discussed the importance of information programs in increasing the participation of disadvantaged and minority students. Federal policymakers must understand the structure and effectiveness of the best current programs--as well as the appropriate roles for participants to play. The presenters in this session represent some of the best efforts to date.

PRESENTATIONS

Dr. Edward A. Johnson described the features of a unique state cooperative to promote minority access and achievement and exhorted the federal government to support similar plans and coordinating efforts at the state level. In Arizona, after a statewide task force called on the Board of Regents to adopt concrete admissions and graduation goals for its ethnic minority youth, and a review of university outreach, admissions and retention programs, the three educational sectors formed a voluntary association--the Arizona Minority Education Access and Achievement Cooperative. Composed of the chief executive officers from the Board of Regents, Board of Education, and Community College Board, the cooperative's primary mission is to aid

the three boards in improving minority student access and achievement. In its first year, the cooperative has provided seed money for small planning and implementation projects and has prepared a compact on "Citizens' Education" that outlines the state's economic interest in improving minority student achievement.

Most significantly, however, the cooperative is now putting finishing touches on the Arizona Compact for Minority Student Achievement, which it believes is the first of its kind. Simply put, according to Dr. Johnson, the Compact "is a unified commitment of the three governing boards to provide the key leadership and structure for reaching statewide achievement targets" in the next decade. Dr. Johnson believes the Compact's key elements--voluntary, equitable civic and educational representation, comprehensive planning, "ownership," participation by senior-level administrators, shared commitment for success, mutual respect and reasonable, self-imposed deadlines--can be replicated elsewhere.

Based on the Arizona experience, in which Dr. Johnson said policymakers learned much about the potential of partnerships, he recommended:

- A new federal-state partnership in which the federal government calls upon states to develop "a broad-based plan for school-college collaboration targeted at minority student achievement" and supports the planning process;

- "Modest" federal support to be accompanied by a requirement that state matching funds be used to implement pilot programs, in order to encourage initiatives that reflect local demographics, governance structures, priorities and fiscal health; and

- Transformation of the Title III Developing Institutions Program into a program targeted at postsecondary institutions enrolling threshold levels of minority students, with requirements for partnerships to expand the high school and community college pools.

Mr. Peter Keitel described a recent New York State student aid initiative and endorsed a national program that would aid states in guaranteeing opportunity to qualified low-income students. Keitel called the New York initiative the first state entitlement grant program of its kind. Beginning in the 1991-92 academic year, the Liberty Scholarship Program will offer awards to eligible students for nontuition college expenses that, combined with other state and federal awards, will cover the full costs of attendance at a State University of New York (SUNY) or City University of New York (CUNY) institution. A companion program, the Liberty Partnerships, already in place, provides counseling and other support services to elementary and high school students deemed at risk of dropping out. About 10,000 students so identified will be served this year.

Thus the Liberty Scholarship Program, according to Keitel, meets both educational and social needs of students early in their academic careers. He cited incentive programs such as that of philanthropist Eugene Lang as evidence that such interventions can be "extremely effective in motivating students who otherwise would not have considered attending college." The New York program is sending the message to students that "if they stay in school, graduate from high school, and gain admission to a college in New York State, lack of money will not be a barrier to their getting a college education." New York hopes to provide such an incentive to as many as 90,000 students a year when the program is fully phased in at a cost of $90 million. The Higher Education Services Corporation, which administers the Liberty Scholarships, is expanding its outreach activities to include the creation of a data base, workshops, brochures, informational mailings and computer software for students and parents to estimate the amount of financial aid they can expect to receive.

Mr. Keitel cited the compelling economic rationale for dropout prevention, saying that the benefits of such efforts far outweigh the costs, as results from Head Start, for instance, have attested. Furthermore, he added, the New York experience points the way for a national entitlement program. New York Governor Mario Cuomo has endorsed a program similar to legislation proposed by the late Representative Claude Pepper. The Pepper bill would assist states in efforts such as New York's and would feature predictable, full coverage of educational costs and funding for counseling at the elementary and secondary levels.

Mr. Wilfred Easter described the 20-year-old MESA program as an "anomaly" among programs being discussed--a direct intervention program that works with students from third grade through graduate school. California's economy is heavily dependent upon high-technology manpower--half of all engineers in the U.S. are employed in the state--and thus has a stake in producing that manpower base. The program is underwritten by the state in conjunction with roughly 95 corporations and foundations.

MESA serves 8,000 students in the K-12 system and 3,500 in colleges of engineering throughout the state, according to Easter. Its mission is to increase the pipeline of those historically underrepresented in the fields of math and science--Mexican-Americans, African-Americans, American Indians and Puerto Ricans. At the elementary and secondary school levels, MESA activities include Saturday academies, summer sessions and sessions for parents, a "math and science Olympics," and other events directed by MESA staff in 18 centers. At the college level, the Minority Engineering Program creates a support network for minority students by clustering them in early courses and providing career guidance and mentoring.

Results of the pre-college program show that 90 percent of MESA graduates enter four-year institutions and two-thirds declare a math-based major; at the college level, 61 percent of MESA students persist, a slightly higher rate than that of Anglo students enrolled in computer science and mathematics, roughly comparable to Asians, and three times the rate of eligible students who do not enter the program.

Mr. Cesar Trimble of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) described the organization's mission as that of promoting equal educational opportunity for Hispanics, equity in funding for Hispanic colleges and universities and building partnerships to accomplish these stated goals. The organization of 75 institutions was founded in 1986.

Mr. Trimble described the three-year-old Hispanic Student Success Program (HSSP), an intersegmental program that serves students from middle school through high school and aims to raise high school graduation, college-going and college graduation rates. Features of the program include enrichment services, tutoring, and college information for elementary through high school students; community outreach with parents and local organizations; a marketing component, which uses mass media to publicize the program in Hispanic communities; and institutional change efforts, which include lobbying and drafting legislation. Major support comes from the Pew Charitable Trust and the Ford Foundation. The Sears Roebuck Foundation recently provided funds to replicate HSSP at sites in the Bronx, Miami, New Mexico and East Los Angeles.

The program is aimed at expanding the pool of college-going Hispanics, according to Mr. Trimble, who expressed concern about whether institutions are prepared to accept and adapt to the successful results of such an intervention. Mr. Trimble estimated that as many as a quarter of Hispanic students enrolled in community colleges are eligible for aid but do not receive it because of limited resources.

DISCUSSION

Because of time constraints, the Chairman suggested that comments be deferred until after the final session was completed.

SESSION IV

The Federal Role and Strategy in Information Programs and Intervention

Moderator: **Dr. Edward M. Elmendorf**
Vice President for Governmental Relations, American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Presenter: **Dr. T. Edward Hollander**
Chancellor, New Jersey Department of Higher Education

Dr. Edward M. Elmendorf observed that the previous comments could be condensed into the following points: the time for action is now; contrary to popular opinion, the target of information and intervention programs is not an informed consumer; students with the ability to benefit from college are made, not born; and financial incentives can persuade those who otherwise would not attend. He added that a tremendous gap persists between local initiatives and a national mandate.

PRESENTATION

Dr. T. Edward Hollander urged "extensive retooling" of the current Title IV programs, and identified several concerns for the Advisory Committee's review. First, he said, the role of proprietary institutions should be reviewed in light of problems that have surfaced with some institutions promising more than they deliver to disadvantaged students. Second, loan programs need to be rationalized once more, particularly in relation to guarantee agency competition and MDE problems. Third, information provided by the federal government is fragmented, insufficient and not useful to students in New Jersey. Fourth, the decline in the federal role in financing postsecondary education vis-a-vis the states must be examined. Finally, he said, interventions provide the key to changing the face of higher education; increases in financial aid or in the amount of financial aid information will not substantially affect the participation or achievement of minority students.

Despite these problems, Dr. Hollander said, successful programs abound in New Jersey and elsewhere; "the question is simply how to institutionalize them." For instance, movement is already afoot in New Jersey and Arizona to set twin goals of proportional enrollments that mirror the state's minority population and comparable achievement in completion and degree awards.

Dr. Hollander argued that a strong federal-state partnership in these areas would be more effective than a stand-alone role by the federal government, and that such a cooperative effort could support several successful models, many of which New Jersey already has implemented:

- A pre-college mentorship program like MESA (previously described) and one developed in New Jersey that reaches about 30 percent of the eligible pool from the sixth grade level on up. Such a program provides information, helps raise aspirations and remove the mystique of higher education for its participants, 80 to 90 percent of whom go on to postsecondary institutions.

- A "special educational opportunity" fund that in New Jersey provides supplementary funds to students and institutions for nontraditional admissions and support services. New Jersey now requires colleges to admit 10 percent of its freshman class through this program, which accounts for one out of every two minority students who have graduated over the last decade.

- Programs to encourage change in institutional structures, through grants for curriculum enhancement, faculty retraining, remedial support, and for enlarging the pool of minority faculty (a particular area for major federal support).

- The Liberty Scholarship/Eugene Lang model of targeted financial support within the context of business/school/college partnerships.

Dr. Hollander said governors and state legislatures now accord minority access and achievement top priority among issues; federal-state partnerships are imperative to ensure the success of state initiatives.

DISCUSSION

The final discussion reflected a variety of issues identified throughout the symposium--the importance of simplifying need analysis for low-income families, the distribution of poor and minority students in postsecondary education, and the features of effective interventions. Several participants urged the streamlining of the financial aid process to permit pass-throughs to those who already qualify for welfare. **Dr. Brian Fitzgerald** briefly described the Advisory Committee's examination of simplification of need analysis. The Advisory Committee is exploring several policy alternatives, including exempting from need analysis very low-income populations as well as those families that receive benefits from federal human resource programs (such as AFDC). In answer to a question about evaluation of the New Jersey educational opportunity fund, **Dr. Ted Hollander** described the process of assessing and ranking institutions according to 15-20 learning outcomes and distributing funds accordingly.

CLOSING REMARKS

Committee Chairman **Mr. James R. Craig** concluded the symposium by thanking participants for their contribution and soliciting input from the community for further ideas. The Advisory Committee's task is to integrate the information it has received and formulate recommendations on the issues, which will be forwarded to Congress in the fall.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A

List of Presenters

Elias Blake, Jr. is the Director of the Division of Higher Education Policy Research at Howard University, in Washington, D.C.

Wilfred Easter is the Director of MESA (Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement Program) Statewide Offices, in Berkeley, CA.

T. Edward Hollander is the Chancellor of the New Jersey Department of Higher Education, in Trenton, NJ.

Maureen Hoyler is the Deputy Director of the National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations, in Washington, D.C.

Edward A. Johnson is Assistant to the Executive Director of the Arizona Board of Regents, and a staff attorney. He is the Chair of the Operating Committee for the Arizona Minority Education Access and Achievement Cooperative.

Peter Keitel is Executive Vice President of the New York State Higher Education Services Corporation, in Albany, NY. HESC was involved in the development and operation of the Liberty Scholarship Program.

A. Dallas Martin, Jr. is the President of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, in Washington, D.C.

John J. McCarthy is the Director of the Division of Training and Dissemination in the Office of Postsecondary Education, United States Department of Education.

Michael Olivas of the Institute for Higher Education Law and Governance, is a professor of law at the University of Houston, and a researcher in the field of minority access and legal issues.

Gary Orfield a professor of political science and education at the University of Chicago, has conducted extensive research at the national, state, and local level on desegregation and a wide range of other issues related to minority student participation in education.

Cesar Mario Trimble is Vice President of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities, in San Antonio, TX.

APPENDIX B

Advisory Committee Members

Following is a list of members of the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance. Five members are appointed by the Secretary of Education and six are appointed by the leaders of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Ashley L. Barron is a sophomore at Drew University in Madison, New Jersey.

Stephen C. Biklen is Vice President of Citibank, the largest originator of student loans in the United States.

Lynn M. Burns is Director of Financial Aid at Roger Williams College, in Bristol, RI.

James R. Craig,* *Chairman of the Committee*, is Director of Financial Aid at Montana State University.

Edward M. Elmendorf* is Vice President for Governmental Relations for the American Association of State Colleges and Universities in Washington, D.C.

James L. Flippin is Director of the Mississippi Guaranteed Student Loan Agency.

Michael S. Katz is the University Director of Student Aid for the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey.

Stanley Z. Koplik* is Executive Director of the Kansas Board of Regents.

David Malek is Associate Dean for Natural Sciences at the College of DuPage in Glen Ellyn, Illinois.

Joseph L. McCormick,* *Vice-Chairman of the Committee*, is Executive Director of the Texas Guaranteed Student Loan Corporation.

Linus Wright, a former Under Secretary in the U.S. Department of Education, is Vice President of Paul R. Ray and Company in Dallas, Texas.

*** Members of the Executive Committee**

Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance
Room 4600, ROB #3, 7th & D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202-7582

202-708-7439